Attorney Docket No. 2002P01596WOUS

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	Lothar Dittmer et al.
Application Number:	10/539,453
Filing Date:	05/01/2006
Group Art Unit:	3743
Confirmation No.:	8061
Examiner:	Stephen Michael Gravini
Title:	DEVICE FOR DETERMINING THE CONDUCTANCE OF LAUNDRY, DRYERS AND METHOD FOR PREVENTING DEPOSITS ON ELECTRODES

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Pursuant to 37 CFR §41.37, Appellants hereby file an appeal brief in the above-identified application. This Appeal Brief is accompanied by the requisite fee set forth in 37 CFR §41.20(b)(2).

Table of Contents

(1) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is BSH Bosch und Siemens Hausgeräte GmbH.

(2) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no appeals or interferences that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-17, 25-29 and 31-47 are cancelled. Claims 18-24, 30 and 48-64 are pending in this application. The final rejections of claims 18-24, 30, 48-58 and 60-64 are being appealed. Claims 18, 48 and 59 are independent. Claim 59 has been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Appellants submit that all of the features of claim 59 are included in claim 60 and, as a result, claim 59 should be rejoined if claim 60 is allowed.

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

In response to the Final Office Action dated July 9, 2010, Appellants filed an Amendment F dated September 28, 2010, traversing the rejections and amending claims 62 and 63. The October 13, 2010, Advisory Action indicates that the amendments made by Amendment F will be entered. No Amendments are outstanding. Appellants filed a Notice of Appeal on October 15, 2010.

(5) SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A first exemplary embodiment, as defined by, for example, independent claim 18, is directed to a device for determining the conductance of laundry in a laundry dryer (page 2, lines 12-21), which comprises: at least two electrodes (page 8, line 20; reference number 2, Fig. 1), each fixed to a respective receiving area (page 8, line 22; reference number 3, Fig. 1) of the laundry dryer; and means for heat reduction (page 9, lines 3-5; reference number 32, Fig. 3) from at least a part of at least one of the electrodes (page 9, line 5-8; Fig. 4), the means for heat reduction operating to reduce a temperature of the part of the at least one electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer (page 6, lines 24-27).

A second exemplary embodiment, as defined by, for example, independent claim 48, is directed to a laundry dryer (page 2, lines 12-21), comprising: an electrode of a moisture sensor (page 8, line 20; reference number 2, Fig. 1) fixed to a respective receiving area (page 8, line 22; reference number 3, Fig. 1) of the laundry dryer; and a cooler (page 9, lines 3-5; reference number 32, Fig. 3) that cools the electrode, the cooler operating to reduce a temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer (page 6, lines 24-27).

(6) GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A) Whether claims 18, 20-24 and 30 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S Patent No. 3,287,817 (the Smith reference)

B) Whether claims 48 and 51 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S Patent No. 2,511,839 (the Frye reference)

C) Whether claim 19 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,141,957 (the Kelm

reference)

D) Whether claims 49, 50, 52, 53 and 61 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference

E) Whether claim 54 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,228,212 (the Turetta reference)

F) Whether claims 55, 56, 58 and 60-64 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Smith reference

(7) ARGUMENT

A) Claims 18, 20-24 and 30 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S Patent No. 3,287,817 (the Smith reference)

The Office Action rejects claims 18, 20-24 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S Patent No. 3,287,817 (the Smith reference). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

i) Claims 18, 20-24 and 30

In its Response to Arguments section, the Office Action discusses 35 USC §112, sixth paragraph, and the required disclosure. Because the Office Action does not include a rejection based on 35 USC §112, second paragraph, Appellants understand that there are no disclosure issues in the application. Appellants do not understand what, if any, relevance the Office Action's citing of authority regarding computer related means plus function claims has to the present application. As a result, Appellants have no response to that portion of the Office Action.

Claim 18 includes the feature of means for heat reduction from at least a part of at least one of the electrodes, the means for heat reduction operating to reduce a temperature of

the part of the at least one electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

Appellants submit that Smith does not teach or suggest electrodes used for assessing conductivity of textiles to be dried. The electrodes 80, 81 of Smith are placed on clothes elevating vanes 66 preferably made of electrically insulating material and lacking any means which could be applied to divert excess heat from the electrodes. Also, the water absorptive material 82 placed below electrodes 80, 81 cannot serve to cool the electrodes. This water absorptive material 82 is simply applied to accumulate humidity in proportion to the humidity content of the textiles to be dried. As the water absorptive material is confined to the immediate surroundings of the electrodes, it will have a temperature equal to the temperature of the electrodes. No cooling effect will exist.

Further, Appellants submit that Smith does not disclose any means for heat reduction that reduces a temperature of any part of an electrode below a temperature of the receiving area of that electrode on the dryer. Even if impeller member 76 of Smith could be considered a means for heat reduction (and Appellants submit that it cannot) there is no indication that impeller member 76 would reduce the temperature of a part of the electrode below a temperature of the area to which that electrode is mounted (its receiving area).

Smith has nothing to do with cooling electrodes. The purpose of Smith is to reduce the likelihood of premature shut off of the drying operation by keeping the moisture content of the absorptive material 82 placed near the electrodes similar to that of the interior of fabrics being dried (col. 3, lines 39-41).

The Office Action asserts that the electrodes 80, 81 of Smith meet the claim limitations because they are placed on insulated vane 66 with water absorptive material 82 between the electrodes. And that water absorptive material 82 thermally insulates and keeps cooling moisture around the electrodes in order to reduce the temperature of the electrodes. Applicants disagree with these assertions.

The electrodes of Smith do not have any heat transfer channel available that could be used to take heat from the electrodes so as to bring their temperature down to below the temperature of their immediate surroundings. Such function necessarily requires something such as a heat transfer channel independent from the immediate surroundings and capable of bringing more heat away from the electrodes than the immediate surroundings could bring into them. As Smith has nothing, such as a heat transfer channel, assigned to the electrodes shown, the electrodes can only, and will only, be brought to a temperature which equates to the temperature of their immediate surroundings. Thus, Smith cannot be said to disclose any means functional and operable to bring the temperatures of the electrodes down to a temperature below the temperature of their immediate surroundings.

In its Response to Arguments section, the Office Action asserts that "the argued temperature below the receiving area feature is inherent because as the electrodes spin inside the drum on the vane, the airflow past the fane (sic) provides a lowering temperature effect since the rotation allows moving air to keep the temperature below the receiving area." Appellants submit that this logic is flawed. The respective receiving area to which each electrode is fixed will be subjected to the same air flow to which the electrode is subjected. As a result, the temperature of the electrode will not be reduced below a temperature of the respective receiving area, as is required by claim 18.

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that Smith does not disclose each and every feature of claims 18, 20-24 and 30 and therefore rejection under 35 USC §102(b) is inappropriate. As a result, Appellants respectfully request reversal of this rejection.

B) Claims 48 and 51 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S Patent No. 2,511,839 (the Frye reference)

The Office Action rejects claims 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S Patent No. 2,511,839 (the Frye reference). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

i) Claim 48

Claim 48 includes the features of an electrode of a moisture sensor fixed to a respective receiving area of the laundry dryer; and a cooler that cools the electrode, the cooler operating to reduce a temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

Appellants believe that the Office Action has misinterpreted the purpose and function of the ring electrodes 54, 55 of Frye. Ring electrodes 54, 55 subject the clothes within the drum of the dryer to a high frequency electric field to dry the clothes (col. 1, lines 28-30; col. 5, lines 1-2). Frye does not disclose or even suggest that ring electrodes 54, 55 in any way sense moisture. In its Response to Arguments section, the Office Action states that the electrodes of Frye are in contact with damp materials. The Office Action does not point to (and Appellants cannot find) any part of Frye that says that the electrodes are in contact with damp materials. Further, the drawings of Frye seem to be clear that electrodes 54, 55 are not in contact with the laundry. The Office Action also states that "damp material is always at a temperature below the receiving area" without any support for such statement. Appellants disagree with this statement.

In the embodiment shown in Frye, ring electrodes 54, 55 are placed outside of the drum and thus outside the region where heating by the field generated by the electrodes occurs. According to Frye however, the electrodes are used to generate a field of strength sufficient to heat up the clothes placed in the field. If Frye contemplates dissipating heat from the electrodes, it cannot be heat that is a part of the heat generated by the RF field. Rather, it would be heat generated from electric current flowing through the electrodes due to the ohmic resistance of the electrodes themselves. However, in the case of a mere sensor application of the electrodes, the RF field would be much weaker, and the problem of excess heating of the electrodes would not occur at all. In addition, the electrodes of Frye are placed distant from the laundry to be dried and even outside the drum containing the laundry. Therefore, the

problem of accumulation of residuals cannot occur with these electrodes. Accordingly, Frye's configuration cannot serve to indicate a means to avert such problem.

Further, Appellants submit that Frye does not disclose any means for heat reduction that reduces a temperature of any part of an electrode below a temperature of the receiving area of that electrode on the dryer.

ii) Claim 51

Appellants submit that claim 51 cannot be anticipated by Frye because claim 51 depends from claims 49 and 50, and claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), not 35 U.S.C. §102. The Office Action specifically states that features of claims 50 and 49 are not disclosed by Frye. As a result, claim 51 (which includes the features of claims 49 and 50) cannot be anticipated by Frye.

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that Frye does not disclose each and every feature of claims 48 and 51 and therefore rejection under 35 USC §102(b) is inappropriate. As a result, Appellants respectfully request reversal of this rejection.

C) Claim 19 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,141,957 (the Kelm reference)

The Office Action rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,141,957 (the Kelm reference). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

i) Claim 19

Claim 19 depends from claim 18. Appellants submit that even if Kelm was available as a reference, which Appellants submit it is not, Kelm does not remedy the deficiencies of Frye discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18.

Appellants submit that Kelm is not available to the Examiner for use in a rejection because Kelm is clearly non-analogous art. "[A] prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*" (emphasis original, M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f). Kelm is neither within the field of Appellants' endeavor nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Appellants were concerned.

The field of Appellants' endeavor is the laundry dryer art. In stark contrast, the field of endeavor of Kelm is the electrical connection art. One of ordinary skill in the art who is in the field of the laundry dryer art would not have been familiar with, nor have looked to Kelm because Kelm is directed to the completely different and unrelated field of electrical connections. Kelm is not within the field of Appellants' endeavor.

Kelm is also not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Appellants were concerned. As clearly explained by the specification at, for example, page 2, lines 12-20, the Appellants were concerned with the problem of preventing layer build-up on electrodes in a laundry dryer. In stark contrast, Kelm is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of effecting electrical connections among a plurality of units (col. 1, lines 9-10). One of ordinary skill in the art who was concerned with the problem of preventing layer build-up on electrodes in a laundry dryer, as the Appellants were concerned, would not have referred to Kelm because it is directed to the completely different and unrelated problem of effecting electrical connections among a plurality of units. Indeed, Kelm has absolutely nothing to do with the problem of preventing layer build-up on electrodes in a laundry dryer. Thus, Kelm is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Appellants were concerned.

Appellants submit that Kelm is neither within the field of Appellants' endeavor nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Appellants were concerned and, as such, is non-analogous art and therefore, unavailable for use in rejecting the claims.

In the present instance, the Examiner clearly did not locate Kelm during a search for relevant art that was within the field of Appellants' endeavor or reasonably related to the particular problem which the Appellants were concerned. It appears that Kelm was located through a keyword search.

The Office Action states that it would have been obvious "to combine the teachings of Frye with opposite electrodes, as disclosed in Turetta, for the purpose of optimizing means of removing undesirable heat in a laundry drying operation with a dual fan operating system." Appellants are confused by this statement. First, in an attempt to respond to the rejection, Appellants will assume that the Examiner meant Kelm instead of Turetta. Second, claim 19 does not address anything to do with "opposite electrodes". Claim 19 includes the feature of the means for heat reduction being arranged on a rear side of the electrodes opposite to a side of the electrodes that face a laundry receiving area of the dryer. Third, claim 19 does not have anything to do with a dual fan operating system.

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of Frye and Kelm does not teach or suggest the features of claim 19 and therefore rejection under 35 USC §103(a) is inappropriate. As a result, Appellants respectfully request reversal of this rejection.

D) Claims 49, 50, 52, 53 and 61 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference

The Office Action rejects claims 49, 50, 52, 53 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference. Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

i) Claim 49, 50, 52, 53 and 61

Claims 49, 50, 52, 53 and 61 ultimately depend from claim 48. For at least the reasons discussed above, Frye does not suggest the features of claim 48.

In addition, claims 49, 50, 52, 53 and 61 ultimately depend from claim 62. Claim 62 includes the feature of the respective receiving area of the electrode being located in a laundry receiving area of the dryer. In contrast, ring electrodes 54, 55 of Frye are not located in the laundry receiving area of the dryer.

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that Frye does not teach or suggest the features of claims 49, 50, 52, 53 and 61 and therefore rejection under 35 USC §103(a) is inappropriate. As a result, Appellants respectfully request reversal of this rejection.

E) Claim 54 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,228,212 (the Turetta reference)

The Office Action rejects claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Frye reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,228,212 (the Turetta reference). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

i) Claim 54

Claim 54 ultimately depends from claim 48 and claim 62. Applicants submit that Turetta does not remedy the deficiencies of Frye discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 48 and 62.

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of Frye and Turetta does not teach or suggest the features of claim 54 and therefore rejection under 35 USC §103(a) is inappropriate. As a result, Appellants respectfully request reversal of this rejection

F) Claims 55, 56, 58 and 60-64 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Smith reference

The Office Action rejects claims 55, 56, 58 and 60-64 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Smith reference. Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

i) Claims 55 and 58

Claims 55 and 58 ultimately depend from claim 18. For at least the reasons discussed above, Smith does not teach or suggest the features of claim 18.

ii) Claim 56

Claim 56 ultimately depends from claim 18. For at least the reasons discussed above, Smith does not teach or suggest the features of claim 18.

Claim 56 includes the feature of the device being operable to reduce the heat of the respective one electrode to a level at which the respective one electrode substantially avoids evaporating liquid entrained in a liquid-air mixture in the interior of the laundry receiving area. Smith makes no mention of avoiding the evaporation of liquid on an electrode.

iii) Claim 60

Claim 60 depends from claim 18. For at least the reasons discussed above, Smith does not teach or suggest the features of claim 18.

Claim 60 includes the feature of the means for heat reduction operating to reduce heat from the first electrode such that the exposed side of the first electrode is substantially prevented from reaching the evaporation enabling temperature. Smith makes no mention of preventing an electrode from reaching an evaporation enabling temperature.

iv) Claims 61-64

Claims 61-64 ultimately depend from claim 48. Claim 48 includes the features of an electrode of a moisture sensor fixed to a respective receiving area of the laundry dryer; and a cooler that cools the electrode, the cooler operating to reduce a temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

As discussed above with regard to the rejection of claim 18, The water absorptive material 82 placed below electrodes 80, 81 of Smith cannot serve to cool the electrodes. This water absorptive material 82 is simply applied to accumulate humidity in proportion to the humidity content of the textiles to be dried. As the water absorptive material is confined to the immediate surroundings of the electrodes, it will have a temperature equal to the temperature of the interior of the drier and the electrodes. No cooling effect will exist.

Further, Applicants submit that Smith does not disclose any cooler that reduces a temperature of an electrode below a temperature of the receiving area of that electrode on the dryer. Even if impeller member 76 of Smith could be considered a cooler (and Applicants submit that it cannot) there is no indication that impeller member 76 would reduce the temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the area to which that electrode is mounted (its receiving area).

Smith has nothing to do with cooling electrodes. The purpose of Smith is to reduce the likelihood of premature shut off of the drying operation by keeping the moisture content of the material 82 placed near the electrodes similar to that of the interior of fabrics being dried (col. 3, lines 39-41).

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that Smith does not teach or suggest the features of claims 55, 56, 58 and 60-64 and therefore rejection under 35 USC §103(a) is inappropriate. As a result, Appellants respectfully request reversal of this rejection

(8) CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing discussion, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the Examiner's rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Howard/

James E. Howard
Registration No. 39,715
December 3, 2010

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-639-7644
Fax: 714-845-2807
james.howard@bshg.com

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1 - 17. (Canceled)

18. (Rejected) A device for determining the conductance of laundry in a laundry dryer, which comprises:

at least two electrodes, each fixed to a respective receiving area of the laundry dryer; and

means for heat reduction from at least a part of at least one of the electrodes, the means for heat reduction operating to reduce a temperature of the part of the at least one electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

19. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 18, wherein the means for heat reduction is arranged on a rear side of the electrodes opposite to a side of the electrodes that face a laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer, such that the rear side of the electrodes is the first area of the electrodes from which the means for heat reduction draws heat.

20. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 18, wherein the means for heat reduction includes at least one of means for improving radiation of heat from the electrodes and cooling surfaces, which are connected to the electrodes.

21. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 18, wherein the means for heat reduction comprises means for air supply and the electrodes are arranged on a component in which openings are formed, cool air being supplied and removed from the electrodes, whereby the cool air is supplied through a middle opening and the cool air is removed through at least one side opening.

22. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 21, wherein the means for air supply are formed by defined faulty air openings in the vicinity of the electrodes, through which ambient air can be conveyed to the electrodes.

23. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 21, wherein the means for air supply comprises at least one of a fan and a source of compressed air.

24. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 18, wherein the electrodes are built fixed in the laundry dryer.

25 - 29. (Canceled).

30. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 21, wherein the air supply means comprises at least one of a fan and a source of compressed air.

31 - 47. (Canceled).

48. (Rejected) A laundry dryer, comprising:

an electrode of a moisture sensor fixed to a respective receiving area of the laundry dryer; and

a cooler that cools the electrode, the cooler operating to reduce a temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

49. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 62, wherein the cooler comprises a pipe inside the electrode.

50. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 49, wherein the cooler further comprises an opening defined by the electrode.

51. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 50, wherein the cooler cools the electrode by permitting air flow through the pipe and the opening.

52. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 49, wherein the cooler comprises a component having a plurality of openings that permit air flow between the plurality of openings.

53. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 62, wherein the cooler permits air to flow from outside of a drum of the laundry dryer into the interior of the electrode to cool the electrode.

54. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 62, further comprising:

a first fan that circulates a first stream of air across a heater, through a drum, and past one side of a condenser to condense moisture from the first stream of air;

a second fan that supplies a second stream of air to cross the other side of the condenser to remove heat from the first stream of air as it crosses the condenser; and

a conduit that provides a partial current of the second stream of air to the cooler.

55. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 18, wherein the electrodes form a voltage applying arrangement and this voltage applying arrangement is arranged on the laundry dryer relative to a laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer so that a voltage applied to the voltage applying arrangement results in a current passing through laundry retained in

the laundry receiving area and the voltage of this current is measured at the voltage applying arrangement.

56. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 55, wherein the respective one electrode whose heat is reduced by the means for heat reduction is exposed to an interior of the laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer to an extent that the respective one electrode is contacted by liquid entrained in a liquid-air mixture in the interior of the laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer and the device is operable to reduce the heat of the respective one electrode to a level at which the respective one electrode substantially avoids evaporating such entrained liquid.

57. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 61, wherein the cooler includes an opening communicating with the laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer, and the cooler permits air to flow from outside the laundry receiving area into the interior of the one electrode to cool the one electrode and thereafter flow out of the one electrode via the opening into the laundry receiving area.

58. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 55, wherein the laundry receiving area is a rotating drum and the electrode is mounted relative to the rotating drum such that the electrode is exposed to a solution of water and laundry fluid that is moving within the drum.

59. (Withdrawn) A laundry dryer, comprising:

a laundry receiving area in which laundry to be dried is retained, laundry in the laundry receiving area being subjected to a drying operation whereby moisture initially retained by the laundry is released into surrounding air as the laundry is dried and the surrounding air increases in its moisture content; and

a device for determining the conductance of laundry in the laundry receiving area, the device including a first electrode and an exposed side arrangement, the exposed side arrangement including a second electrode, the second electrode having an exposed side that is exposed to the laundry receiving area to an extent that the second electrode is contacted by a moist air mixture in the laundry receiving area, the device being operable to apply a voltage to the first electrode and the second electrode of the exposed side arrangement that results in a current passing through laundry retained in the laundry receiving area, thereby permitting a voltage measurement proportional to a moisture content of the laundry, the device applying a voltage in a manner such that the exposed side of the second electrode of the exposed side arrangement can reach an evaporation enabling temperature sufficient to evaporate liquid in the air mixture in contact with the exposed side in the absence of a heat abatement measure, and the exposed side arrangement operating to substantially prevent the exposed side of the second electrode from reaching the evaporation enabling temperature in spite of the application by the device of a voltage that would otherwise cause the exposed side of the second electrode to reach the evaporation enabling temperature.

60. (Rejected) The device as claimed in Claim 18, wherein the at least two electrodes are in the form of a first electrode and a second electrode, the first electrode having an exposed side that is exposed to a moist air mixture in a laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer in which laundry is retained, the moist air mixture occurring when laundry in the laundry receiving area is subjected to a drying operation that results in moisture initially retained by the laundry being released into surrounding air as the laundry is dried and the surrounding air increasing in its moisture content as a consequence thereof, the device being operable to apply a voltage to the second electrode and the first electrode that results in a current passing through laundry retained in the laundry receiving area, thereby permitting a voltage measurement proportional to a moisture content of the laundry, the device applying a voltage such that the exposed side of the first electrode can reach an evaporation enabling

temperature sufficient to evaporate liquid in the moist air mixture in contact with the exposed side of the first electrode in the absence of a heat abatement measure, and the means for heat reduction from at least a part of at least one of the electrodes operating to reduce heat from the first electrode such that the exposed side of the first electrode is substantially prevented from reaching the evaporation enabling temperature in spite of the application by the device of a voltage that would otherwise cause the exposed side of the first electrode to reach the evaporation enabling temperature.

61. (Rejected) The laundry dryer of claim 62, wherein the moisture sensor includes another electrode and the one electrode of the moisture sensor having an exposed side that is exposed to a moist air mixture in the laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer, the moist air mixture occurring when laundry in the laundry receiving area is subjected to a drying operation that results in moisture initially retained by the laundry being released into surrounding air as the laundry is dried and the surrounding air increasing in its moisture content as a consequence thereof, the device being operable to apply a voltage to the another electrode and the one electrode that results in a current passing through laundry retained in the laundry receiving area, thereby permitting a voltage measurement proportional to a moisture content of the laundry, the device applying a voltage such that the exposed side of the one electrode can reach an evaporation enabling temperature sufficient to evaporate liquid in an air mixture in contact with the exposed side of the one electrode in the absence of a heat abatement measure, and the cooler operating to cool the one electrode such that the exposed side of the one electrode is substantially prevented from reaching the evaporation enabling temperature in spite of the application by the device of a voltage that would otherwise cause the exposed side of the one electrode to reach the evaporation enabling temperature.

62. (Rejected) The laundry dryer as claimed in Claim 48, further comprising a laundry receiving area in which laundry to be dried is received,

wherein the respective receiving area of the electrode is located in the laundry receiving area of the dryer.

63. (Rejected) The laundry dryer as claimed in Claim 62, further comprising a second electrode of the moisture sensor,

wherein the electrodes form a voltage applying arrangement and this voltage applying arrangement is arranged on the laundry dryer relative to the laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer so that a voltage applied to the voltage applying arrangement results in a current passing through laundry retained in the laundry receiving area and the voltage of this current is measured at the voltage applying arrangement.

64. (Rejected) The laundry dryer as claimed in Claim 63, wherein the respective one electrode whose heat is reduced by the cooler is exposed to an interior of the laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer to an extent that the respective one electrode is contacted by liquid entrained in a liquid-air mixture in the interior of the laundry receiving area of the laundry dryer and the cooler is operable to reduce the heat of the respective one electrode to a level at which the respective one electrode substantially avoids evaporating such entrained liquid.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

RELATED APPEALS APPENDIX

None